

Amendment
Serial No. 09/846,608

Docket No. PHFR 000044

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending. Claims 1-4 stand rejected. Claims 5 and 6 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7-9 are objected to as being in improper form and have not been evaluated on the merits.

Claims 1-9 are amended. Claims 10-12 have been added. No new matter has been added.

The examiner has objected to the title of the invention as being not descriptive and suggests that the title should be "Subband scanning the flag interpretation to reserve the spatio-temporal 3D wavelet structure of video data using set partitioning."

Applicant wishes to thank the examiner for his suggestion of the title. However, applicant believes that the suggested title does describe the invention as an "encoding method for the compression of a video sequence. The specific details of the encoding method need not be included in the title. Accordingly, applicant believes that the existing title is sufficient to describe the invention and elects not to amend the title.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The examiner has objected to claims 7-9 as being in improper form.

Applicant wishes to thank the examiner for his observation and has amended claim 7 to remove the multiple dependence cited. Claims 8 and 9, which depend from claim 7 have been amended for reasons other than multiple dependency.

Accordingly, having amended claim 7 to remove the multiple dependency, applicant submits that the reason for the examiner's objection to the claims has been overcome and the objection can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests the amendment be entered and the objection withdrawn.

Amendment
Serial No. 09/846,608

Docket No. PHFR 000044

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin ("3D Listless Zerotree Coding for Low Bit Rate Video"). It is the examiner's position that Lin describes each and every element of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses the examiner's rejection of the claims. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. As will be shown, Lin does not, expressly or inherently, describe each and every element recited in the claims.

With regard to independent claim 1, this claim recites:

1. An encoding method for the compression of a video sequence ...
comprising the steps of:

(A) preserving the initial subband structure of the 3D wavelet transform by scanning the subbands one after the other in an order that respects the parent-offspring dependencies formed in said spatio-temporal tree;

(B) adding "off / on" flags to each coefficient of the spatio-temporal tree in view of a progressive transmission of the most significant bits of the coefficients, these flags being such that at least one of them describes the state of a set of pixels and at least another one describes the state of a single pixel.

Lin, on the other hand, discloses a 3DLZC method of compressing low bit rate video wherein temporal and spatial wavelet transforms are grouped in a root set, a branch set and a leaf set. Lin further discloses the use of an F_C map to indicate the significant pixel positions and an F_D to indicate the significant descendant sets' position. Hence, the flag (F_C and F_D) maps of Lin are related to pixel positions and neither the F_C nor the F_D maps "describes the state of a set of pixels" or "the state of a single pixel," as is recited in the claims.

Accordingly, claim 1 includes claimed subject matter not found in the reference cited and is therefore patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Lin cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Lin does not disclose each and every element recited in claim 1.

Amendment
Serial No. 09/846,608

Docket No. PHFR 000044

Having shown that Lin does not disclose each and every element recited, applicant submits that the reason for the examiner's rejection has been overcome and the rejection can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and claim 1 be allowed.

Notwithstanding the arguments made above, claims 2-9 ultimately dependent from claim 1, which has been shown to include subject matter not disclosed in, and hence, patently distinguishable over, the Lin and the Tham references cited. Accordingly, claims 2-9 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

Applicant, through his attorney, wishes to thank the examiner for his indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5 and 6, if rewritten to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening dependent claims. However, applicant respectfully submits that for the amendments made to the claims and the remarks made herein make all the claims in an allowable form. Accordingly, applicant elects not to amend the claims as indicated would be allowable by the examiner at this time. However, applicant reserves the right to amend them at a subsequent time.

With regard to new claims 10-12, applicant submits that these claims represent a system for performing the method recited in claim 1. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests that these claims be entered.

Furthermore, applicant submits the claims were amended to more clearly describe the subject matter claimed as applicant's invention and to correct errors in form. The amendments were not necessarily to overcome the reference cited. Accordingly, the amendments made are not related to patentability and do not alter or limit the substance of the subject matter claimed.

Amendment
Serial No. 09/846,608

Docket No. PHFR 000044


Having addressed the examiner's objections and rejections under 35 USC §§ 102 and 103, applicant submits that for the amendments and remarks made herein the reasons for the examiner's rejections have been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections and that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Should any unresolved issues remain that the examiner believes may be resolved via a telephone call, the examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney at the telephone number below.

No fees are believed necessary for the filing of this Amendment and Response.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell Gross
Registration No. 40,007



By: Steve Cha
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,069

Date: 8/11/04

Mail all correspondence to:
Russell Gross, Registration No. 40,007
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9608
Fax: (914) 332-0615